

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>CHARMAIN LENAY OTTLEY,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:20-CV-1686</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting</b>	:	
<b>Commissioner of Social Security,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 27th day of December, 2021, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 19) of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, recommending that the court deny plaintiff Charmain Lenay Ottley’s appeal from the decision of the administrative law judge denying Ottley’s application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, and the court noting that Ottley has filed an objection (Doc. 20) to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), and following *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report, see E.E.O.C. v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)), and affording “reasoned consideration” to the uncontested portions, see id. (quoting Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)), the court agreeing with Judge Carlson that the administrative law judge’s decision “is supported by substantial evidence,” 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), a standard of review that the Supreme Court of the United States recently reiterated “is not high,” Biestek v. Berryhill, 587 U.S. \_\_\_, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019), and finding Judge Carlson’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record,

and further finding Ottley's objection to be without merit and squarely and correctly addressed by the report,<sup>1</sup> it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Carlson's report (Doc. 19) is ADOPTED.
2. The decision of the Commissioner denying Ottley's application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income is AFFIRMED.
3. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of the Commissioner and against Ottley as set forth in paragraph 2.
4. The Clerk of Court shall thereafter CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner  
United States District Judge  
Middle District of Pennsylvania

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the rationale set forth in Judge Carlson's report, we note that Ottley's objection seems to be grounded in a misapprehension of the administrative law judge's decision. Ottley contends that the administrative law judge erred by not "provid[ing] adequate rationale for rejecting Plaintiff's report that she does not get along with others." (See Doc. 20 at 3). But the administrative law judge did not "reject" Ottley's subjective report; to the contrary, the administrative law judge specifically accounted for Ottley's allegation by finding she "has up to moderate limitations interacting with others," (see Doc. 12-12 at 16), and, in crafting Ottley's residual functional capacity, by specifically limiting Ottley to work in which she has "no more than occasional interaction with supervisors[ and] coworkers, and no interaction with the public," (see *id.* at 19). We note that Ottley's objection also asserts, in the concluding paragraph, that the administrative law judge "improperly rejected the testimony of Plaintiff and her mother, and failed to properly weigh the opinions of Drs. Bailey and Baker." (See Doc. 20 at 3). Ottley's mother did not testify during either of the administrative hearings, and Ottley has not directed the court to any reports from a Dr. Bailey or Dr. Baker; we presume this argument is inadvertent carryover from another brief and do not consider it.